

remarks; but this is not an excuse. This is very serious.

We are now faced with the biggest deficit in the history of this country; and every single Member, Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, should be worried about it because we are passing this on to our kids and our grandkids. That is no joking matter. That is serious.

I believe if we do not reverse this trend, we will undercut our ability to grow jobs. So I want tax relief, but I also want us to be fiscally responsible and pay for it. That is consistent with the statement of my colleague from North Carolina, who I have great admiration for. I just wish when we say these things, we would actually fight to make them a reality on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and would just say that I am glad the gentleman agrees that we need tax relief and we need fiscal constraint, because the budget we are looking at bringing forward, of course, has a freeze on spending, which is a very important part of this to reduce the deficit.

And again I would just say that we have a difference in how we look at this and how we pay for the tax cuts, because we believe that there will be increased monies coming in to the Treasury through the economic generation that is done with the tax relief. It has happened throughout history. And because of that, we will see the tax cuts paid for and the deficit reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), another distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I thank my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a traditional rule for legislation that amends the Internal Revenue Code, and I am pleased the House will have the opportunity to consider the merits of the underlying legislation and also an amendment from the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Tax Code remains hopelessly complex. Just a few years ago, it was so convoluted from years of tax changes that it punished married taxpayers merely because they were married. Unfortunately, only under this current monstrosity of a Tax Code could the marriage penalty that this House eliminated reappear in the very near future. This rule before the House, H. Res. 607, will give Members of the House an opportunity to consider legislation that not only makes the Tax Code fairer but also ensures that we can halt a targeted tax increase on married Americans.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) for introducing this important legislation, H.R. 4181, which extends indefinitely the tax relief that the Congress and President Bush enacted in 2001 and 2003 to help married couples.

Previously, our income tax code penalized couples who got married, frequently forcing them to pay higher taxes than if they had remained single. If we fail to enact H.R. 4181, tax rates will revert to their pre-2001 levels, and the marriage tax penalty will be reinstated at the end of this year.

As a Nation built on strong families, we should promote marriage, not penalize it. Our tax system should not discourage getting married and raising a family. Therefore, it is imperative we pass H.R. 4181 today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so we may proceed to debating the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Democratic substitute that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) will offer. I think it is a responsible way to approach this issue because it supports marriage penalty tax relief, but it pays for it.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina mentioned that their budget resolution urges that we pay for additional spending programs. I am all for pay-as-you-go rules, but I think they should also apply to tax cuts. I think it is the responsible thing to do.

I think all of us here would like to go home to our districts and talk about all the tax relief that we can provide our American families; but I think without specifying how we are going to pay for it, it is really irresponsible. It is a nice press release. It is a nice kind of public relations item. But if we do not pay for it, what we are really doing is we are passing the burdens on to future generations, to our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren.

My grandfather used to say to me that you cannot have dessert without first having your spinach, and I think that that is a good lesson for us to apply to how we do business on the House floor. It is nice to get up here and talk about tax cuts and tax cuts and tax cuts, but it would be better to do so in the context that we pay for them. I think that is what the American people expect. That is what American families have to do. They pay as they go. They have to live within their means, and I think that same lesson should apply here.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the rule, but I would urge my colleagues very strongly to do the responsible thing and to support the Rangel-Matsui Democratic substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I say to my friend from Massachusetts that tax cuts do not cost money, they make money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4219, by the yeas and nays; and S. 1904, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2004, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4219.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4219, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Bono	Coble
Ackerman	Boozman	Cole
Aderholt	Boswell	Collins
Akin	Boucher	Conyers
Alexander	Boyd	Cooper
Allen	Bradley (NH)	Costello
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Cox
Baca	Brady (TX)	Cramer
Bachus	Brown (OH)	Crane
Baird	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Baker	Brown, Corrine	Crowley
Baldwin	Brown-Waite,	Cubin
Ballance	Ginny	Culberson
Ballenger	Burgess	Cummings
Barrett (SC)	Burns	Cunningham
Bartlett (MD)	Burr	Davis (AL)
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bass	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Beauprez	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Camp	Davis, Jo Ann
Bell	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Bereuter	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Berkley	Capito	DeFazio
Berman	Capps	DeGette
Berry	Capuano	Delahunt
Biggart	Cardoza	DeLauro
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	DeLay
Bishop (GA)	Carson (OK)	Deutsch
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Case	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Castle	Dicks
Blumenauer	Chabot	Dingell
Blunt	Chandler	Doggett
Boehlert	Chocola	Dooley (CA)
Boehner	Clay	Doolittle
Bonilla	Clyburn	Doyle